UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese } *Associate Editors*

Cycles and Religious Interests

By CLARENCE R. SKINNER

India's Future

By JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND

A Radical View of Prohibition

By GEORGE H. SHOAF

Do Boys Have a Conscience About War?

By WILLIAM C. ALLEN

VOLUME CVI NUMBER 22

Chicago, February 9, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA NAGELEY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
DAVID STARR JORDAN
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
WALTER WALSH
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
ITALY—DOROTHY WALTON
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 339
Cycles and Religious Interests—CLARENCE R. SKINNER 341
Jottings—J. H. H 343
ARTICLES—
India's Future—JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND 344
A Radical View of Prohibition—GEORGE H. SHOAF 345
Thoughts of Tolstoy—*Part XIII* 346
Do Boys Have a Conscience About War?—WILLIAM C. ALLEN 348
POETRY—
To the Republicans of North America (1812) [And to the Republicans of India (1931)]—*Percy Bysshe Shelley* 339
Across the Plains—ROBERT R. LOGAN 343
Mirage—ADELAIDE L. SHANKLIN 347
THE STUDY TABLE—
Literature in the Scientific Field—MAYNARD SHIPLEY 349
Jewish Experiences in America—EMANUEL STERNHEIM 350
THE FIELD—
Dickens' Sober Second Thought 338
Some Conclusions of a Recent Seminar—*Herbert C. Herring* .. 352

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Dickens' Sober Second Thought

George Bernard Shaw has said recently:

"To rouse their [Americans'] eager interest, their distinguished consideration and their undying devotion, all that is necessary is to hold them up to the ridicule of the rest of the universe."

This speaks for itself, of course. Comment is unnecessary. But then he goes on:

"Dickens won them to him forever by merciless projections of typical Americans as windbags, swindlers and assassins."

Over against this, one instinctively puts the emphatic words of Charles Dickens himself, uttered at the dinner given to him in this city, in 1868, by 200 representative newspaper men of this country, immediately before his final sailing for home.

He had lectured widely here, and had given somewhat extended attention to us in "Martin Chuzzlewit" and "American Notes." He had said many things regarding Americans that were certainly picturesque, but which were also as certainly essentially untrue in giving, to readers of those books, anything like an accurate picture even of the United States of sixty years ago. Quite evidently in the full consciousness of this, as he stood before his distinguished and representative audience on the occasion indicated, he uttered these manly words:

"So much of my voice has lately been heard in the land, that I might have been contented with troubling you no further . . . were it not a duty with which I henceforth charge myself, not only here, but on every suitable occasion, whatsoever and wheresoever, to express my high and grateful sense of my second reception in America, and to bear my honest testimony to the national generosity and magnanimity; also to declare how astounded I have been by the amazing changes I have seen around me on every side—changes moral, changes physical, changes in the amount of land subdued and peopled, changes in the rise of vast new cities, changes in the growth of older cities almost out of recognition, changes in the graces and amenities of life, changes in the press, without whose advancement no advantage can take place anywhere.

"Nor am I, believe me, so arrogant as to suppose that in five-and-twenty years there have been no changes in me, and that I had nothing to learn and no extreme expressions to correct when I was here first. And this brings me to a point on which I have, ever since I landed in the United States last November, observed a strict silence, though sometimes tempted to break it, but in reference to which I will, with you good leave, take you into my confidence now. . . .

"What I have intended, what I have resolved upon (and this is the confidence I seek to place in you) is, on my return to England, in my own person, in my own journal, to bear, for the

(*Continued on Page* 352)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVI MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1931 NUMBER 22

TO THE REPUBLICANS OF NORTH AMERICA
(1812)
[And to the Republicans of India (1931)!]

Brothers! Between you and me
Whirlwinds sweep and billows roar;
Yet in spirit oft I see
On thy wild and winding shore
Freedom's bloodless banners wave,
Feel the pulses of the brave
Unextinguished in the grave,
See them drenched in sacred gore,
Catch the warrior's gasping breath
Murmuring "Liberty or death!"

Shout aloud! Let every slave,
Crouching at Corruption's throne,
Start into a man, and brave
Racks and chains without a groan;
And the castle's heartless glow,
And the hovel's vice and woe,
Fade like gaudy flowers that blow—
Weeds that peep, and then are gone;
Whilst, from misery's ashes risen,
Love shall burst the captive's prison . . .

—Percy Bysshe Shelley

Whatever Britain does in India she does too late. The release of Gandhi from prison, ironically on the very day of the first anniversary of the Indian Declaration of Independence (January 26th), is the most recent case in point. Had this release been granted before the Round Table Conference, or while the Conference was in session, or on the day when Mr. MacDonald proclaimed the results of the Conference to the world, it might have meant something as a gesture of generosity and confidence. As it is, the release of the Mahatma appears only as an action forced upon the British government by the exigencies of a situation which it cannot control without the cooperation of the Indian leader. And not only is this action thus too late, but it is also too restricted. While Gandhi and certain of the great leaders of the nationalist movement are suddenly restored to freedom, tens of thousands of their more humble followers are still held behind the bars for offenses much less serious than those committed by those released. The amnesty should obviously have been extended to all, or else everywhere withheld. This means, of course, that initiative passes at once into the hands of Gandhi who must lay it down as a condition of all negotiation with His Majesty's government that all prisons must be emptied. We can think of nothing more delightful than the spectacle now before us of MacDonald dancing feverishly to Gandhi's piping in a desperate endeavor to find steps which will fall into harmony with the music of India. That the Premier will succeed seems just as doubtful to us now as it did in the beginning. Gandhi, thanks to the devotion of three hundred millions of his fellow-countrymen, is master of the situation, and anybody who thinks that he is going to throw away this mastery without winning for his nation what he has called "the substance of independence," is very much mistaken. So far from "the substance of independence" being found in the proposed new constitution, it would be difficult to find even the shadow. The Round Table, like everything else, came too late. Agreements which would have been a boon a dozen years ago, are now an insult. Gandhi knew what he was saying when he told his jailer on his release that he would be back in a couple of months.

Was there ever so much talk and excitement over many things, and ever so little actually done? The Pope's Encyclical—how it went around the world, and what reams of space it occupied in the papers and what hours of time in the pulpits! But did it affect in any way the institution of marriage, or the practice of procreation? Not in the slightest! The majority of Catholics will go right on breeding as of yore, and the rest of us will go right on sanctioning voluntary parenthood. The Wickersham Report—what a noise it made, and what a furious clamor raged for days after its appearance! But did it solve the question of Prohibition, or change the opinion of any solitary voter, "wet" or "dry"? Not so far as we could notice it! If this Report did anything, it made "confusion worse confounded." The Round Table Conference—with what a flourish it adjourned, and with what eloquent words Premier MacDonald announced its program to the world! But what did it avail in India? So far as we can determine, the Nationalists are unrepentant in their firm conviction that their country must and shall be free. And then there is the disarmament question, which has been discussed for weeks, and months, and

years, and decades, and now just lately has been discussed anew at Geneva. What does this mean? Not a thing! The nations are piling up their armaments faster than ever, with disarmament talk about as effective as a dog's baying at the moon. It's a great old world, with leadership as defunct, ideas as scarce, ideals as dead, as in the Dark Ages of European history. In that period the fine spirits among mankind, powerless to effect any change in a lawless and barbarous society heedless of its own inevitable doom, withdrew from the world, that they might cherish in cloister and study those higher influences of mind and spirit which had to be kept alive if ever humanity was to be revived. Are we approaching again such an era of history as this?

Curious—how the talk about war debts keeps bobbing up! Yet not curious at all! For there can be no settlement of world difficulties, no ending of the present industrial depression, no removal of the monstrous menace of a "next war," until these debts have been gotten rid of. The curious part of the situation is that there should be so much talk and so little done, when the solution of the dilemma is before the face and eyes of everybody. This solution involves two perfectly simple propositions. First, cancel the German reparations which never should have been levied, and never will be paid. Secondly, abolish or at least reduce armaments, so that there may be guarantee that the money saved by the forgiven debts will not be immediately appropriated to larger armies and huger navies. The key to the whole debt problem, of course, lies in the hands of the United States. Meet the two conditions named above, and this country could be reasonably asked to strike off all debt settlements whatsoever. But without these conditions, America will never cancel the debts, and all talk about it is just so much wasted wind. It seems curious to us that there are no statesmen in the world wise enough to see this fact, or brave enough to act upon it. Think of what Herbert Hoover might achieve if he would lead in action of this kind, and ask the nations of the world to follow! But initiative and vision have not existed in Washington since Woodrow Wilson laid down the burdens of his office. Wilson failed, but as gloriously as he did tragically. He at least developed programs, cherished ideals, and sought to lead the nations out of the wilderness of 1914-1918 into the promised land of peace. And that he failed was not wholly his own fault!

In the town of Guelph, Ontario, Canada, there is a prison which has no walls or bars, where no guard carries gun or club, where any prisoner if he is so moved, can escape at any time. This prison has been in operation for over twenty years. It comprises about a thousand acres of farm and orchard land and maintains a woolen mill, a cannery, a wood-working factory, a bed factory and a quarry. The work is done by prisoners, seven hundred in number, who include some of Canada's most dangerous criminals, among others a hundred "lifers." Every prisoner has a good place to sleep, good food to eat, plenty of work and entertainment to occupy his time, is taught a vocation if he has none, and is paid for his labor with money sent to his family or held for himself until the hour of his release. This Guelph prison has never had a riot nor even a near riot, and averages less than two escapes a year. In Massachusetts there is a prison run on exactly the same principle as this Canadian prison. This institution also has long-term prisoners and "lifers," and also has a record of no riots and a minimum of escapes. It is obvious that prisons can be run successfully on scientific and humane principles. We have only to trust to justice and good will in our relations with our fellow-men, even the worst of them, to find that these ideals always succeed. St. Paul had the idea centuries ago when he wrote: "Love never faileth."

We walked down a single city block the other day —a block some two hundred feet long—and we saw, among other things (1) three automobiles parked at an illegal distance from the curbstone, (2) a janitor dry-sweeping the sidewalk, (3) an unmuzzled dog, (4) a newspaper thrown into the gutter for every wind to play with, (5) a group of boys playing football in the street, (6) a fruit vendor crying his wares from his wagon, (7) a man spitting on the sidewalk, and (8) several houses without visible numbers. All these things were seen in a single stroll down a single street in the space of a few minutes—and every one of them a violation of some old and familiar city ordinance! Other evidences of disregard of law in any community today are seen at every turn—automobiles running without lights, automobiles parked in disregard of time limits, obstructions or encumbrances on sidewalks, loud-speaking radios in front of radio shops, peddling without licenses, blocked fire-escapes or entrances, *et cetera ad infinitum.* We Americans pay no attention to law unless we are watched, or are troubled by our neighbors. We simply go ahead and do what we please. And yet there are people who talk about lawlessness as having something particular to do with Prohibition, and argue that if the 18th Amendment were repealed, law and order would instantly and everywhere be reestablished! An especial instance of innocency is the nonchalant assumption of the "wets" that, after ignoring or flouting all existing laws against liquor, they can immediately substitute other laws which will be happily obeyed. What assurance is there that any law placing any restriction upon "booze" will be heeded by the man who wants what he wants when he wants a *drink?* Simple Simon was of course never more naive

than the "wets" in their idea that a relaxation of restriction is going to result in a tightening of observance. When the "wets" can agree upon what they are going to put in the place of Prohibition, and then how this can be enforced better than Prohibition, we shall begin to take them seriously. As it is now, whenever this question is raised, the "wets" imitate the action of Stephen Leacock's hero who "mounted his horse and rode off furiously in every direction."

We have heard much about the plight of the churches in Russia. But what about the plight of the churches in America? In the Soviet Republic there is going forward the most systematic attempt to get rid of churches that history has ever known. It is true that the Soviet constitution, while decreeing the separation of church and state, expressly guarantees the free exercise of religious worship. It is true that, under the protection of this guarantee, the churches are open and services being held as under the old regime. But it is also true that the Soviet government is hostile to religion, and is doing everything within its power to stamp it out. The whole new generation of Russian boys and girls is being educated to atheism just as deliberately as they are being educated to Communism, and the Bolsheviki forecast the day, within the lifetime of those now living, when in all Russia there will be nobody so mean as to do reverence to God. If there is nothing of this in America, there is on the other hand an indifference to religion which may well in the long run prove as disastrous to the churches as organized hostility. It is not difficult to prove that persecution fertilizes religion. "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." What is fatal is not antagonism without but neglect within. It is when people don't care enough about religion even to think about it, least of all to vindicate and serve it, that its extinction is something more than a possibility. It is this situation which exists in the United States. The blight of neglect is over all the churches. Golf is more important than services of worship, radios more attractive than preaching, automobiles more comfortable than pews. Sunday is no longer a day to go to church, but a day to attend the "movies," or to enjoy week-end parties, or, in the last extremity, to loaf at home. Beautiful music, sensational preaching, a great public crisis, can still entice people to the sanctuary. But ordinarily the church is now the last thing instead of the first. We sympathize with the Bishop who, speaking of Russia some months ago, said that it was better for Christianity that Christ should be persecuted than that he should be forgotten.

Cycles and Religious Interests

Havelock Ellis points out in his "Dance of Life" that there is a "general rhythm which marks, not life only, but the universe." It is observable in stars and tides, in nebulae and insects. The whole creation throbs with a systole and diastole.

This law of rhythm of life is exhibited in the psychic pulse of the individual over a twenty-four hour period. Hunger and satiety, exercise and repose, vocation and avocation follow each other with familiar regularity. The rhythm is observable over a longer period of a year when we feel the pull of the wanderlust, and call of home; when we follow sports or serious study; when the flame of the sexual life burns or ebbs, and so on through innumerable changes. It is this "dance of life" that makes living zestful and alluring but uncertain and fickle. Professor R. B. Hersey of the University of Pennsylvania has recently made a study of these personal cyclical fluctuations which reveals the interesting fact, always sensed but seldom charted, that there is a "definite periodicity" in both capacities and emotions. In order to fulfil our best life and attain our highest creative possibilities, we must obey the law of change in our routine and give free play to the imperious urge to continually swing in psychological circles. The pattern of life is irregular.

There seems to be a justifiable analogy in this case between the life of the individual organism and the life of social groups. Interests in the various institutions and settled customs of men does not proceed steadily and in a straight line, but are rather periodically broken, interrupted, pushed forward or retarded. The social mind is almost as fickle as the individual mind. Group emotions are notoriously unstable. One characteristic applies to groups of every clime and time, namely, the swinging of the pendulum of interest.

If all individuals of each new generation were born on the same day of the same year, and went through the same stages at the same time, there might be a clear cut cycle of social life, for the variations in the actions and reactions of individuals might concur. There would obviously not be a complete concurrence of moods, because each individual organism would retain its innate uniqueness of behavior, thus making a standardized social pattern impossible. But there might be a sufficient amount of uniformity to see strongly marked cycles.

But generations are not born that way. There are no clear cut lines where one generation begins and another leaves off. Vast numbers of people are in transitional stages. It is this fact which makes it difficult to trace the rising and falling of social interests in history. While one group may be following an

ascending curve another group may be descending. While people of one age may be just entering a period of enthusiasm for art, another group may be turning to the consolations of philosophy. It is this fact which makes it difficult to obey Matthew Arnold's admonition to "see life steadily and see it whole" because neither we ourselves as observers nor human kind as the observed are on a stationary platform.

But despite the difficulty, most sociologists and historians believe that the evolution of man shows definite movements of social interest which can be charted with some degree of accuracy.

The many careful studies which have been made in recent years on the business cycle illustrate the principle under consideration. Orgies of speculation and spending are followed by periods of intense depression, unemployment and suicide. Economists hoped a few years ago that they had brought our financial structure under control to such an extent that they could "iron out the curve"—but, alas! what disillusion in the panic of 1929! Control may eventually do much to eliminate extremes of social pendulum-swinging. But there seems to be an indispensable minimum of cyclical nature in groups which can never be entirely eliminated or mastered. Cultural forms surge, ebb and resurge. Militarism and pacifism, science and religion, commerce and art alternate in the power and place which they hold in society.

This fact seems to be borne out by the study of the history of man from the earliest of times. For instance Professor Cleland in "Our Prehistoric Ancestors" points out the interesting fact that Paleolithic art degenerated and disappeared from living culture, and when neolithic man arose he had new interests and new modes of life which crowded out much that was best in their predecessors.* An old cycle came to an end, and a new cycle had begun. Some interests which had flourished died and others which had died revived. And from that time on we can see the ebb and flow of cultural change.

Empires rise to their maximum extent; these independent nationalisms emerge and break up the vast machinery of imperial control. Learning spreads, then dies down except in a few monasteries. Railroads are built and poetry declines. Theology flourishes so that whole communities are stirred and divided over it. Then it subsides and men become indifferent to its contentions.

The importance of this law of history for a proper understanding of religious life is obvious. It gives a perspective greatly needed in the study of religious problems, and ought to form the background for any serious study of the place and function of religion in the Twentieth Century.

Religious consciousness, like every other form of human consciousness is conditioned by this cultural ebb and flow. It is impossible to separate the psychic life of the individual from society, except for the sake of purely theoretical analysis. Professor Cooley and Professor Ogburn have amply demonstrated the fact that the individual and society as separate entities do not exist. *"The real thing is human life"*† which consists of organisms in culture. The tides of life therefore sweep men along with their currents. They do not wholly destroy the uniqueness of the individual, nor do they act with equal force upon all persons. They do not wholly determine interests for it is possible in human society to resist and select our environment. Stout individualists and unsurrendered idealists may resist the pull of social currents to some extent. But taken in the large and historic sense, the thinking and feeling of the majority of men ebbs and flows with the popular tide.

What, then of the times in which we live? The answer is not clear, for there are many cross currents and back-flows. It is possible for large numbers of persons to become so isolated or insulated that they live a life in harmony with the psychic dominant of other times. Extreme examples might be lonely mountaineers and highly specialized college professors. But *on the whole,* does any one doubt that the distinctive life of the twentieth century is to be found in the achievements of capitalism and the growth of the scientific spirit, rather than in a powerful and dominating religious life?

The interpretations of this phenomenon may vary. We have on the one side such writers as Oswald Spengler who believes that the signs of the times point inevitably to a general decay. He says:

> The Classical died, as we shall die, but it died unknowing. It believed in an eternal Being and to the last it lived its days with frank satisfaction, each day spent as a guest of the gods. Before us there stands a last spiritual crisis that will involve all Europe and America. What its course will be, Hellenism tells us.‡

If this be true, then religion, at least in its finest and highest phases will degenerate into superstition or neglect. This particular cycle of the public mind will swerve downward and will draw the majority with it. This has happened with religious movements before, such as Buddhism, Taoism, Greek and Roman religion. In fact it seems to be an inevitable law that religions have their phases of superstition, neglect, and death.

The question at stake for us, however, is not whether religion is receiving its death blow, finally passing out of society forever. Religion has too great a vitality for that. It has proved its resilience too often to take seriously the prophecies of its utter disappearance. The question is rather one of proportion and relation. It has happened in the past that the social environment has become so antagonistic to the sense of higher values that they have temporarily de-

*"Our Pre-Historic Ancestors," Herdman F. Clelant—Coward McCann, 1928.

†"Social Organization," by Charles H. Cooley, Scribners. See also "Social Change," by Ogburn.

‡"Decline of the West," Oswald Spengler, p. 424.

cayed, and some forms of high culture have disappeared in some places. Religion, like art or philosophy or music will not cease to exist but persons may cease to live an effective or full religious life for long periods of time. When art declines, it will revive, but the persons who live in the period of decline will miss to a very large degree the sensitizing and enriching experience of beauty. When religion declines it will revive. But during the period of decline untold numbers of persons may fail to experience what religion does toward making life rich and full.

But even if a western society *as a whole* is not entering a decline such as that described by Spengler, religion might decline *relatively* to a place of lesser importance.

Is not this exactly what has happened in our time? We have seen ecclesiastical interest and values decline not only relatively but absolutely. We have seen such secular interests and values as education rise on a swiftly incoming tide.

After the passionate outburst of religious interest at the time of the Reformation and the founding of the sects, we have seen the public become wearied of theological disputation and become almost *indifferent* to ecclesiastical control. For a time even religion, the deep and eternal need of man, becomes swamped by wars, economic, and international crises, and other interests, both individual and social.

But as we have been riding in the trough of the wave, so there seems to be little doubt that we will again mount the crest. There are certain values which cannot be found in our characteristically scientific and capitalistic type of civilization. There are deep hungers of the soul which man must satisfy. There are longings of the heart for some kind of cosmic integration. And religion provides a satisfaction for those needs.

Unquestionably religion will have to be formulated anew so that its intellectual aspects can be in complete harmony with the scientific spirit. But this change is only a superficial one. Underneath the need for restatement and reforming, there is a need for something vastly more important. And we look forward with confidence to the time when people realize that need and their interest in the fundamentals of religion will again quicken, and the eternal cycle will take another turn.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

Jottings

England ran up a record last year of seven unsolved murder cases. But that's nothing! The United States can beat this record in a week, or sometimes in a single day.

The last French ministry lasted one month and eleven days. It's a pity that France does not know American football, for if she did she could arrange substitute ministers to jump into the political game at short notice.

A famous astrologer foresees a decline in church attendance during this year, 1931. It doesn't need an astrologer, or even the seventh son of a seventh son, to prophesy this development. Any cross-roads clergyman could have done the same.

If music is the food of love, play on;
Give me excess of it, that, surfeiting,
The appetite may sicken, and so die.

So the Duke, in Shakespeare's "Twelfth Night"! But this was before the age of jazz. One needs no "excess" of modern music for the "appetite" to "sicken, and so die."

To help, or not to help—that is the question which is bothering the life out of our American capitalists these days in relation to Soviet Russia. To help is to aid in the establishment of Communism, capitalism's deadliest foe. Not to help is to lose large and immediate profits, always dear to every capitalist heart. What to do? *What to do?*

Inflated Reputations—(8) George Wickersham—since his famous Report was published!!

J. H. H.

Across the Plains

Across the vast, the boundless seeming plain,
Mile after mile toward the declining day,
With tireless speed upon its iron way
Thunders the steam-impelled, impetuous train;
Mile after mile of pastures and of grain,
Cattle and farms and the brown domes of hay,
Where wild-eyed pioneers but yesterday
Struggled with parching lips and burning brain.

Onward they marched to reach the Western sea,
On golden visions fed 'mid storm and strife,
By faith inspired and through freedom bold.
Now is their dream fulfilled and it is we
Must Westward move across the plains of life
By visions led of something more than gold.

ROBERT R. LOGAN.

India's Future

At the close of the London Round Table Conference, announcement was made by Premier MacDonald, that it is the intention of the British Government, as soon as a New Constitution can be framed and certain necessary preliminaries can be arranged, to grant India "responsible government," "self-rule," but with certain "reservations," certain "necessary reservations" as "safeguards."

If this means that India is to be given real self-rule, a government really and fully responsible to the Indian people, which she has long demanded as her right, then there seems every reason to believe that Indian discontent will cease, and the dark cloud full of thunderings and lightnings which today hangs over India and over the British Empire on account of India, will pass away.

But is this what the proposed "self-rule with reservations" and "responsible government with reservations" really mean? Practically all India is troubled. Why are reservations necessary for a great historic nation which in the past ruled itself for two or three thousand years without reservations, and occupied a place of honor and influence in the world second to that of no other nation? Cannot such a nation rule itself now? If not, why not? Has 170 years of British rule caused such degeneration in her that she cannot do again what she did for so long a period with distinguished success. India feels insulted by these reservations.

She also distrusts their meaning. What can their real meaning be? Are they not another "smoke-screen" such as she declares she has experienced so often from her present foreign rulers? Is not offering self-rule with these reservations, on the part of Great Britain, another instance of professing to give without really giving? Of "giving with one hand and taking back with the other?" Under the name of granting India self-rule, does not Britain by her reservations really deny her self-rule, refuse to give her self-rule? If I may quote the language of the Editor of *New India* (Madras),

> In holding out to India so-called self-government with these limitations attached, are India's foreign lords offering her anything whatever but the trappings of self-government without self-government at all?

These are vital questions. Word comes that virtually all India is asking them with intense earnestness.

Just what are the reservations? The answer is as follows: 1. Great Britain is to control India's "Defense," that is, India's "Army." India possesses, and is to continue to possess, a large army. What does control of it mean? If we, in the United States, had a large army and it was controlled by Germany, or France, or Japan, or Great Britain, and if we had not a single soldier under our control, could it be said in any true sense that we were free or possessed self-rule? This exactly illustrates what British control of the Indian army means. Does not all the world know that any nation whose army is wholly in the control of a foreign power, instead of being free and self-governing in any true sense, is under serious and dangerous bondage?

2. In the New Constitution which is to be offered to the Indian people, Britain is to control India's Foreign Political Relations. What does that mean? It means that India cannot officially communicate with any other nation, she cannot make a foreign treaty, or do any kind of foreign business. She cannot send to any nation an Ambassador, or a Minister, or a Consul, or any official to represent her; nor can she receive any Ambassador, or Minister, or Consul, or official representing any foreign nation. She cannot be recognized as a nation by any other nation, she can have no place among the nations of the world. To all the world she is not to be a nation at all, but simply a subject province of Great Britain. Will this be self-rule? Will it be anything but unbearable bondage?

3. Britain is to control India's Foreign Finance, Foreign Exchange, Foreign Credit. That is to say, in financial matters India is to be in the absolute power of Great Britain. Indian financiers claim that one of the important causes of India's impoverishment has been the fact that in the past Indian finance has been under British control. They claim that by changing the value of the rupee and manipulating India's currency in the interest of Britain, and by creating artificial ratios of exchange between India and England, the British Government has drained from India untold millions of her wealth. Under the proposed New Constitution for India, all this is to go right on. It is an axiom in statesmanship that economic power underlies and controls political power; and that whoever controls the credit of a nation really controls the nation. Under such conditions, will the claim that India possesses self-rule be anything but a mockery?

4. While in the proposed New Constitution for India the Viceroy (or Governor General) is to be responsible in a measure to the Indian National (Federal) Legislature, and therefore indirectly to the people of India, *he is to be given autocratic and arbitrary power greater than any past Viceroy has ever possessed.* In other words, he is to have power to dismiss Ministries at his will, which means that, in what he may claim to be a time of "emergency," he can control legislation, or even dismiss the Legislature, and rule the country by arbitrary edicts, or virtual martial law, exactly as Lord Irwin has done for nearly a year past —imprisoning tens of thousands of India's worthiest citizens and filling the land with unpardonable brutalities.

Nor is this all. Since the Governors of the Provinces (as well as the Governor General) are to be appointed by Great Britain without India having any voice or power in the matter, there is no way in which India will be able to prevent great Provinces from being governed by tyrants like Sir Michael O'Dwyer, or to prevent British Generals like General Dyer from being forced on communities with power to perpetrate future atrocities like those of the Punjab or future massacres like that at Amritsar. Will this mean Self-Rule for India?

Such then are the four main "Reservations" (there are others but these are the most important) which Great Britain makes an indispensable part of the New Constitution which she graciously offers to the Indian people.

Under such a Constitution, will India in any true sense possess "responsible government"? On the contrary, will she not be a subject nation as really as in the past? The chains with which she is to be bound will be somewhat different in form, and they will be

slightly longer in this direction and in that so as to allow her a little more liberty of movement in her bondage, but are they not to be chains still, chains of steel, essentially as strong and as bitter as those of the past have ever been?

JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND.

A Radical View of Prohibition

So long as there is profit in liquor it will be made and sold. If the demand for it appears to diminish, immediately it will be artificially stimulated, and this stimulation will continue while profits are made from its manufacture and sale. This motivation of conduct applies with equal emphasis to the traffic in tobacco and narcotics, and to the commission of nearly all forms of crime. Profits constitute the mainspring of action in our present acquisitive society, and nowhere does the profit motive find illustration more concretely than in the liquor traffic. Obviously, to get rid of liquor and tobacco and narcotics and crime, the thing to do is to make indulgence therein unprofitable. And this is the thing the friends of Prohibition and good government rarely ever feature in their discussions or emphasize in their programs of action.

Laws aimed at the suppression of crimes against persons and property have been enacted and enforced since the establishment of civilized government on this continent, and today, according to statistics available to the investigator, there are more crimes per capita committed in this country than in any previous decade. Prohibition does not prohibit for the reason that more money is made defying the law than obeying it.

In penning these words the writer voices his views as a lifelong foe of liquor, tobacco, narcotics and crime. His sympathy with every effort to destroy the liquor traffic is absolute; in fact his opposition to the use of alcoholic stimulants is so intense that it amounts almost to an obsession. With him the abuse of one's body is an offense as great as a crime against the social organism. This consideration aside, his interest in the labor movement is such that, as he views it, if that movement is ever to advance to the achievement of its historic mission, the manufacture, sale and use of liquor intoxicants must be specifically and permanently forbidden.

Liquor stupefies the individual, stifles ambition, annihilates hope. On the other hand, it transforms an undisciplined army into an unmanageable mob. Many a labor strike has been lost because of excessive drinking on the part of strikers and outright drunkenness by those handling the strike. Several of the brightest minds in the American labor movement have been marred and the ability of their possessors to lead the hosts of labor lessened as a result of their addiction to the liquor habit. Liquor, no less than blind superstition, is an opiate from which the working classes must abstain if ever they expect to win individual or collective freedom.

At the moment there is being conducted in this country an agitation to repeal the federal Prohibition Amendment, and to restore the legal right to make and sell strong drink. This agitation is carried on under the guise of personal liberty and the right of the individual to do as he pleases so long as the rights of others remain unimpaired. The right of the total abstainer to the use and enjoyment of his country free from the liquor traffic apparently is of no concern to these personal liberty advocates.

However, the attainment of personal liberty, much as it may deceive the unsophisticated, is not the real motive animating those who have projected this agitation. Powerful leaders in the realm of finance, big bankers and the heads of investment houses, anxious, as they claim, to equalize support of the government among all classes, thereby relieving themselves of what they term an unjust burden, have conceived the idea that if liquor is again manufactured and sold under federal supervision, the tax accruing therefrom would tend to lighten their own tax burden. In short, the enormous tribute collected by the government from the rank and file of the nation's drinkers, it is calculated, would relieve the rich of their alleged disproportionate share of the nation's taxes, and cause the taxes to be levied upon the liquor-stimulated appetites of the poor. What intellectual somersaults have been turned on this point by the editors of a lot of liberal journals and newspapers, who ordinarly are champions of social and economic justice, and who have permitted themselves to be lined up with the big financiers in their campaign to put across their program of nullification and national debauch!

What, then, must be done if the traffic in intoxicating liquor is to be effectually abolished? Here is where strong men and brave, in their efforts to answer this question, witness the complete collapse of their strength and bravery. Editors of religious journals and pulpiteers of renown alike fail in their analysis and understanding of the fundamentals involved in the problem. They fail to get to grips with the economics of the situation, from which alone can proceed a lasting solution of the liquor question, or indeed of any question relating to the commission of crime. Like their predecessors of the nineteenth century and their ancestors of the tenth, these well-meaning editors and ministers persist in trying remedies which never remedied and which will never remedy in a thousand years.

Since liquor is made and sold for profit, and since liquor would not be made to sell if there were no profit in the traffic, logically and inevitably it follows that if the manufacture and sale of liquor is ever to be abolished, the element of profit must be eliminated. That is all there is to it; and yet what a tremendous program of social and economic reform is involved in the effort to wipe out the profit motive!

Shall this thesis be elaborated to its inexorable conclusion? Have the advocates of Prohibition the courage to go forward to the adoption of a program of action that promises to realize their objective? Have they the stamina to fight with those who are struggling to eliminate the profit-motive through the inauguration of a new social and economic order?

Profits constitute the very mainspring of the system of production and exchange which economists call capitalism. When profits cease, the system chokes, business stagnates, industry suspends, hard times come, and unemployment is here. To continue the capitalist process, it is imperative that capitalists—the owners of industry and business—make profits; and it is immaterial how profits come, whether through the manufac-

ture and sale of shoes, automobiles, foodstuffs, liquor, tobacco or narcotics. The morality or immorality of the process is of no concern to the profit-makers and profit-takers.

Profits depend upon private property rights. Those rights are of little value when profits disappear. Profits are closely connected with interest, rent, and the wages system. When profits are abolished, these factors automatically will vanish. Since interest, rent, the wages system and profits are the factors vital to capitalism, their disappearance means the end of capitalism.

A program carrying with it the abolition of the profit system, if made effective, asserts the conscientious objector, would be revolutionary and confiscatory. What of it? We have a precedent, for revolution and confiscation in the Eighteenth Amendment. Property worth millions of dollars was confiscated outright when that revolutionary measure became a national law. Besides, which is more important—the piling up of millionaire profits, or the abolition of the liquor traffic?

Profits, and the profit system, must go, and forever, if the liquor traffic is permanently to cease. Until it goes, all talk of effective Prohibition is academic.

GEORGE H. SHOAF.

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day" here published for the first time in English*]

XLIV

1.

There are two ways of getting rid of poverty; one is to increase our wealth, the other to accustom ourselves to be satisfied with little. To increase our wealth is not always possible and is always dishonest; to decrease our fancied needs is always within our power.

2.

The time will come, and soon, when men will cease to believe that wealth gives happiness, and will at last understand the simple truth that, by gaining and keeping wealth, men make their lives not better but worse.

3.

Ten simple men will lie down on one felt rug and go peacefully to sleep, but two rich men cannot live in harmony in ten rooms. If a simple man gets a loaf of bread, he will share half of it with the hungry. But if a king conquers one part of the world, he cannot rest easy until he has seized another part like it.

4.

When you have bought a fashionable ornament for yourself, you have to buy ten other things so that everything about you should be in keeping. For this reason the rich are never satisfied with what they have, and always want more.

5.

For a rich man it becomes more and more shameful to live, and for a poor man more and more provoking.

XLV

1.

In every man dwells one and the same spiritual principle, and this spiritual principle is so great, that, in view of its identity in all, no distinctions between men can have any meaning whatsoever. And therefore no rational man should or can consider himself either superior or inferior to others.

2.

The crude superstition of patriotism is based on the snare of the inequality of men. This superstition is encouraged by the organization, on funds collected from the people, of public festivals, spectacles, memorials and holidays which incline men to recognize the exclusive significance of their own nation and the greatness of their own government and its rulers, while disposing them to malevolence and even hatred toward other nations.

3.

There is no situation which cries aloud against Christianity, against the natural feeling inherent in all men and against common sense, to a greater extent than the situation of servants in rich houses.

4.

Ever more and more the consciousness of the unity of all men is being spread abroad in mankind.

5.

Men who in preaching morality limit your duties to the confines of your family and your fatherland are preaching egotism, more or less liberal, but nevertheless harmful to you and to others. The family and the fatherland are two circles included in the still greater circle—mankind. They are two steps which it is necessary to pass, but on which we should not stop. (*Mazzini.*)

6.

The consciousness of our own unity, flowing from the consciousness of a single divine principle in all, gives men supreme welfare, both the inward, personal, and the outer, social welfare; therefore all is evil that hinders this unity, and all is good that furthers it. Superstition and the division of men above all else hinder unity, while truth and love further it.

XLVI

1.

"An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life." This is not human but brute law. And such a law is ascribed to God!

2.

He who has even once experienced the joy of returning good for evil, will never lose an opportunity to win this joy.

3.

What is the use of men's reason and above all of the love that is stored in their hearts, if it is only possible to deal with them as with animals—by threats and violence?

4.

It would seem clear that it is impossible to extinguish fire with fire, to save oneself from flood with water, and to reform evil with evil. But men, instead of recognizing their low animal need of vengeance as a sin, try to prove that revenge is a sensible thing, necessary for the welfare of themselves and others.

5.

Revenge, the return to him who offends, insults or injures us, of the very thing that he did to us, when justified by false arguments, becomes the pernicious

doctrine that properly organized violence may be of use to men.

6.

It is possible temporarily to prevent men from doing what they want to do, by violence; but such a stoppage will be only temporary. As a dam cannot stop the water of a river, so no violence can change either the feelings or the thoughts of men. Such thoughts and feelings will sooner or later call forth their own fulfilment.

7.

It would seem clear that if we do evil to a man in return for what he has done to us, then this man, who usually does not acknowledge the evil that he did, will want to return the same evil to the man who wronged him. So that the evil we do will surely serve to increase evil. But men do not see this, do not want to see it. Their not seeing it, however, cannot change and does not change the very fact that every return of evil for evil only increases it, to infinity.

8.

Men say that life without violence is impossible and that a just order of life can only be established by violence. But if men establish a just order of life by violence, then those men who establish such an order should know just what justice is and should be just themselves. But if some men can know what justice is and can themselves be just, then why should not all men know this and all men be just?

How clear it is from this argument that the violence of rulers is only vengeance, and does not achieve the aim that is assumed.

9.

One dog bites another, and the other snaps back; a horse kicks another, and the other kicks back; a child, a feeble-minded person, a man deprived of reason do likewise. But in our time it is quite impossible to understand how the "eye for an eye, and tooth for a tooth" written in savage times into the laws recognized as those of God, can be accepted. It is time men freed themselves from this terrible delusion.

XLVII

1.

Men want to remain as bad as they were, but they desire that all life should be better.

2.

Listen to what I order, but do not look at what I am doing.

3.

It seems very easy and quite effective to invent a social order under which all men would become better; and therefore people are glad to work at the reorganization of society, and neglect their own inner perfection —the only means of really improving the life of society.

4.

Just as there are superstitions about false gods, prophecies, ritualistic means of pleasing God and saving one's soul, so there is a general superstition to the effect that men can make others lead a good life by violence. The superstitions about gods, prophecies and mysterious means of saving the soul are already beginning to fall and are almost overthrown; but the superstition about a government order that will make men happy is accepted by all, and in its name the greatest crimes are committed.

5.

To organize the outer forms of social life, without inner perfection, is just the same as to take the rough stones of a tumble-down building and re-lay them on a new plan without mortar. However you lay them, still there will not be shelter from the weather, and the building will still tumble down.

6.

All the sufferings of men come from ignorance. Salvation from suffering lies in knowledge. True knowledge is attained by perfection; and hence there is one salvation from suffering: perfection. Perfection is attained by every man through labour over himself in tranquillity, and never by outward changes in the forms of life. Work over the outer forms of life, as it goes on in our Christian world, not only disturbs the tranquillity that is indispensable for inner work, but always lowers the level of morality, since in the course of these outward changes it involves men in deeds opposed to true perfection.

7.

If there ever were a time when heroes and sages were morally so superior to the general level of men, that the majority willingly and naturally submitted to all their demands (even those opposed to its own interests), and when this majority itself recognized the beneficence of its rulers' violence—if there ever were such a time, that time is already long past. In our day it is difficult to find men who would fail to understand not only that those who rule over them are not morally superior to them, but that almost always they are inferior to the majority of men. It is difficult to find a man who would fail to judge the deeds and orders of these rulers, for the greater part not approving them, but not daring to oppose them, because he cannot count on general, simultaneous support. In our time such a relationship of subjects to their rulers, whether these rulers be monarchs or elected by the people, is only maintained by custom, but it has long been felt that this relationship is no longer in keeping with the times.

8.

The forthcoming change in the organization of life for the people of our Christian world consists in the substitution of love for violence, in the recognition of the possibility, the ease and the blessedness of a life founded not on violence and the fear of it, but on love. And hence this change can in no way come to pass through violence.

(*To be Continued*)

Mirage

This plodding I may never find
The city, glimpsed in loveliness
Sometimes,
Against the dream clouds of my mind;
But it is Peace to know
That in the Vast which is the Whole,
Somewhere,
That shimmering city really lies,
Else—how should even high moments give
Its mirrored beauty to my eyes?

ADELAIDE L. SHANKLIN

Do Boys Have a Conscience About War?

Do lads have a conscience about war or preparation for war? Many have. Do they understand that military equipment and training scares other countries into enlargement of defense and that history reveals that resulting fears and jealousies eventually lead to war? They do. Do they try to reconcile war with the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount? Many do not. Do Christian lads feel that allegiance to Jesus rather than allegiance to the state is the way out of international fears and discord? The number is constantly increasing. Are some of these young men prepared to suffer fines, imprisonments, misunderstanding rather than violate their Christian consciences? They are. Does it require personal and spiritual courage to take such a stand? It does. The history of compulsory military training for lads in Australia and New Zealand is a case in point. The writer has been in New Zealand twice and in Australia three times since 1915. Compulsory military training of lads in those countries has been so thoroughly exploited that investigation into its practical operation is important. In essence it is the same as conscription. The visit of the United States fleet to Australia in 1908 resulted in a great wave of military enthusiasm in that country followed by the desire to arm. The Defense Act of New Zealand in 1909 was made possible by the agitation of the National Defense League and other influences. The result of a combination of circumstances, seized by the militarists to their own advantage, without any direct reference to the will of the people, and at first backed by some well-meaning citizens, was that the governments of those countries in time of peace put their helpless boys under military discipline to which the voters of Australia, even in time of war, would not themselves submit.

The young people to whom I refer were of the high school age in the United States. At first military training was in high favor but as time went on and as parents discovered the meaning of it for their boys a slump in interest commenced. The newspapers bristled with threats of prosecutions for failure to train, but this tendency has greatly decreased of latter time.

An oath was demanded of the boys in New Zealand in which they were made to promise "that they would observe and obey all orders of his Majesty, his heirs and successors, and of all the generals and officers set over them." This oath, it is alleged, was often forced by threats of fine and imprisonment on lads, and on parents who refused consent to their boys binding themselves to so drastic a surrender of their consciences into the keeping of the military authorities.

In both countries there have been many severe prosecutions of boys. The regulations in both countries provided alternative service and assumed relief for members of denominations opposed to military service, also assumed relief for others who, because of religious convictions, resisted drill. As a consequence the consciences of people, not members of denominations "forbidden by the doctrines of their religion to bear arms," have often been coerced. Not infrequently prosecutions and punishments were dealt out to those for whom the law provided relief.

A parliamentary return produced in New Zealand, September 3, 1913, showed that at least 13,153 lads had not enrolled to that date. During three years the prosecutions reported in that little country, then having a population of about 1,200,000, had amounted to 10,245. The history of punishments in the barracks and military fortresses of New Zealand seems unbelievable.

Thus, Ripa Island Fortress, near Lyttleton, was the scene of extraordinary punishments. The Lyttleton *Times,* a leading newspaper, in the issue of June 13, 1913, tells of how boys "were handed over to two officers of the Permanent Artillery and walked to the wharf escorted by artillerymen with fixed bayonets." When lads refused to drill or do military work some of them were put on half rations. When complaint was made about the small amount of food a sergeant-major remarked: "Send for a doctor when you see any of them beginning to go down." The minutes of evidence produced before the joint legislation committee on the matter of conscientious objectors—and schoolboys were often found to have a conscience—revealed their sad plight at Ripa Island. All of these lads did not suffer on account of conscience, but many did.

Older lads organized themselves into the Passive Registers' Union.

They held large meetings, printed and distributed literature; gave financial assistance, where needed, to the families of lads who were gaoled; bought a printing press and published their own monthly paper, the *Repeal.* The leaders were arrested and sent to gaol; those outside organized large protest meetings. When the prisoners were released, they, too, held meetings describing their treatment in gaol.

The detail of the resistance of the sons of liberty-loving English and Scotch people to military encroachments is an amazing story.

I have personally conversed with lads who have suffered imprisonment for conscience's sake in the Antipodes. A well known instructor of Australia, John F. Hills, M. A., and other sources of information, have stated that under the operation of the Defense Act up to June 30, 1914, there had been 27,749 prosecutions of boys from 14 years of age and upward in Australia, who had been dragged into the degrading influence of police courts in connection with prosecutions. About 20,000 resulted in fines. Australia at that time had a population of about 4,500,000. In New Zealand refusal to drill included, among other punishments, a penalty of five pounds on lads of 16 years or upward. Up to the above date there had, in Australia, been imprisonments of lads of 14 years of age and upward amounting to 7,093. There has been much testimony as to the moral danger to lads in detention barracks and jails. The above mentioned John F. Hills, when speaking of training has written, "Your boy, respectable father, cannot pick his mates, as at school, he must stand where ranked." Hills speaks of the "levelling down" of the "military machine." The alleged theory as to value of military training yielding beneficial disciplinary results does not seem to be borne out by facts, as far as I have been able to observe.

But a change came with the war. Public opinion has since been changing still more. Australia and New Zealand suffered terribly in the Great War and the assumed glamor and glory of the contest went down before the moral and physical damage of the hour. At the present time the Conscription Act is still in operation and the lads are being prosecuted as of yore but

none are being sent to prison for refusing to drill. A correspondent writing from New Zealand recently has informed me, "Fines are inflicted and if these are not paid the lads generally have their property distrained or are fined again and again." The question of religious objection is causing trouble at the present time. Another correspondent in New Zealand has recently written, "Compulsory military training is still the law, but there is a growing feeling against it. The public conscience is gradually awakening against it for various reasons."

Under date of July 17, 1929, the *New Zealand Herald,* of Auckland, reported about the case of two young men. The following day much more was said on the subject. The action of the Public Questions Committee of the Presbyterian Assembly, taken July 17, 1929, is peculiarly interesting. No doubt the noble stand then taken by this committee on behalf of religious liberty and rights of conscience was, at least partly, a result of the now recognized terrible loss to Church life following the Great War. They asked that all young men be exempted from military training when conscientiously opposed thereto.

Very recent information from Australia indicates that the defense act is weakening—a warning to other countries. The prosecution has, for the present, ceased as a result of the Hoover-MacDonald negotiations.

At this hour there are not a few young men behind prison bars in European countries—not in free England—because they cannot conscientiously take military training. At this hour there are strong influences working at Washington, D. C., maintained by men who confidently expect to force compulsory military training upon the lads of the United States. If they are successful, and such a system is once established, it will be inevitable that rights of conscience of many lads, and of their parents, will be oppressed. In such a case one of the chief glories of the Republic will go down. Military training of boys in our high schools constitutes the opening wedge. I have frequently seen in this country little boys, 10 and 11 years of age, in soldier's uniform, putties, etc., with guns, who take military training. In the parade in Denver, Colorado, on Armistice Day, 1929, there were many such lads, with thousands of other little fellows looking on. I do not know of a European country where such extraordinary sights are witnessed. What will become of the efforts of Herbert Hoover and Ramsey MacDonald under such circumstances? Will the military people be willing to give up the grip they are quietly securing? Does not history tell us that there is but one end to militaristic enthusiasm? Have not the churches taken a stern grip on the situation? Is there not need that our churches yet more vigorously grapple with this leading question? The military machine can become a dangerous machine. If it is not going to be set up in the United States many protests must be made to our school authorities, and to officials at Washington, D. C., before it is too late.

WILLIAM C. ALLEN.

The Study Table

Literature in the Scientific Field

No doubt there are scientists who, like a doctor referred to by Dr. Drachman, would be moved to raucous laughter at the very mention of a "literature of science," presupposing the one to be antithetical to the other. But any such laughter must be emitted before this book* is read, for the author has more than sustained his contention that

> the sharp contrast which is so often assumed to sever literature and science is really as misleading a standard as the proverbial contrast between white and black. . . . A great many books are more or less science as well as more or less literature—or are they?

The book under review was written as "a consistent answer" to this question. The answer is not only in the affirmative, but of a nature sufficiently conclusive to take the laughter out of any doubting doctor.

One may only object that Mr. Drachman is too apologetic for his subject. He says:

> It was the gracious practice of our ancestors to begin every book by inditing an apology or an argument. . . . Today it is, if possible, even more binding upon one who wishes to add another book to the immense debris of paper and print already existing to tell why he does so or to show unmistakably what useful purpose his book may serve. . . . In short, what reason is there for a discussion of the literature of science?

The reader might expect the next sentence to be to the effect that this reason will be given by a thoughtful reading of the chapters following. Instead, thirty-two pages are sacrificed to a further apology. The book itself quite justifies its writing and publication, and no prolonged justification was (as the doctors say) indicated.

It goes without saying that a book of this kind has long been needed. The laughing doctor apparently had never read Lyell, Darwin, Wallace, Huxley, Tyndall, Wallace, Proctor, Clifford, Lankester, Mivart, Lubbock, or many other English (not to mention American) scientists who elevated the ordinary diction of science to "literature" in the best sense of that word. Science is based upon a recognition and, to a certain extent, an understanding of reality; and reality is truth. As Keats long ago taught us, truth is beauty. Unfortunately many scientists know an insufficient portion of "truth" to be able to turn it into "beauty." Those scientists who have helped to make the recognition of truth beautiful are those who have, within reasonable limits, seen nature more or less as a whole, and who have therefore been able to discuss natural phenomena in a language at once veridical, simple, and graceful.

This full appreciation of the beautiful, marvelous, or awesome in nature excites emotion; and the best literature is the finest and noblest expression of emotion. Thus there is no natural hiatus between science, primarily concerned with truth, with the acquisition of knowledge, and literature, primarily concerned with beauty. No novelist, essayist, or poet ever experienced deeper emotion than does the scientist face to face with the discovery of a new and important fact or with the experimental verification of a new theory. Drachman is right: our libraries are crowded with volumes

> that present both science and art, both knowledge and emotion intermingled, blended together in various proportions and with various degrees of assimilation.

Studies in the Literature of Natural Science. By Julian M. Drachman. Published by the Macmillan Co. $4.

Although this book is the first of its kind in the history of book-making, "sent forth as a sort of first call," not pretending to be a definitive treatment of scientific literature, its interest and value do not depend upon this fact. Merely as reading matter for the average layman, it is itself one of the best examples of humanized works concerning science, or scientific writing, that has ever been offered to the public. Its scope is entirely too limited for it to be described as in any sense even a short history of natural science, or a selected biography of natural science writers. Nevertheless, one is surprised at the broad field covered, and the number of scientific books evaluated—largely, of course, as literature. The biographical data is brought, apparently incidentally, into the narrative, but in the end one feels quite well acquainted personally with most of the makers of scientific history whose life and work are incorporated in the running discussion of style and diction of the more important (especially British) authors. The reason for their immense popularity is sought out and explained, so that among other features the book is a guide to the successful humanization (as opposed to the mere popularization) of authentic science.

It seems a bit churlish to find minor fault with a pioneer work of this nature, but one cannot help wondering why in the great space devoted to Darwin frequent reference is made to Dorsey's "The Evolution of Charles Darwin," published in 1927, while no mention is made of Henshaw Ward's splendid "Charles Darwin, The Man and His Warfare," issued in the same year. Ward is besides one of the happiest of current writers of humanized science. So is likewise Edwin Tenney Brewster, whom also Mr. Drachman does not mention.

Mr. Drachman repeats (page 41) the popular misconception of Cuvier's teaching that "the entire life" of each geological age was "wiped out" by successive cataclysms. Cuvier did not hold the view that life was created anew after each presumed catastrophe; on the contrary, he held that isolated parts of the earth might have been spared on occasion when the rest of the earth was laid waste, and that animals and plants propagated their kind anew from these isolated cases.

Again, he finds that in Germany "von Baer, du Bois Reymond and Bronn led a growing array in the cause of 'Darwinismus'." Von Baer was, as is well known, an evolutionist before the appearance of Darwin's "Origin," but was, along with the eminent German botanist, Wigand, the zoologist Kölliker, and others, an aggressive opponent of *Darwinismus*. Von Baer saw in evolution a march to a preordained definite goal (*Zielstrebigkeit*), under the direction of a personal creator. For him, the primary cause of the developmental process was *not* the operation of "natural selection," but the will of Deity. After Haeckel, it was Karl Gegenbaur, the most eminent comparative anatomist of the time, who did most to establish *Darwinismus* in Germany.

One is somewhat surprised to see Mars referred to (page 42) as "our nearest neighbor except the moon"—Venus being nine million miles, occasionally eleven million miles, nearer than Mars's nearest approach to the orbit of the earth.

One regrets, also, to find such phrases as, for example,

> The newer discoveries of the physicists, by superseding the crude materialism of the nineteenth century, have diminished the old-style "cock-sure" attitude of scientists that what they know is identical with the whole truth.

Is there not quite as much of the new-style "cock-sure" attitude among contemporary opponents of materialism (monism)? Then we are informed that "dead matter" is dead, "and something that is much too lively for comfort, at least, for intellectual comfort, has taken its place," the theory of relativity having "turned material into force and abstraction"—a reverberation of Eddington as mystic and Quaker. Mr. Drachman applauds also those modern scientists who find no conflict "between religion and science," knowing full well that the required word in this sentence is "Christianity," not "religion," which latter term may mean anything or nothing at all; and that its avoidance by either Mr. Drachman or the authors to whom he alludes is merely a futile sop to the Fundamentalists.

However, these are all points without great importance, invalidating not at all the high standard of the book as a whole. The book is enriched by six full-page illustrations, a very satisfactory and useful bibliography of thirty-seven pages, a full index of authors cited, and the replies to the extremely interesting questionnaire on which its writing was based. It is an excellent first example of a new type of book, giving inspiring insight into the literary masterpieces of a group of related sciences of the nineteenth century, one of the most vital periods in the whole history of science.

MAYNARD SHIPLEY.

Jewish Experiences in America

The motivation of this book* is wholly commendable and its execution though not without blemish is on the whole admirable.

The volume is intended to help American Jews in their relationships with non-Jews and to enable non-Jewish readers to get some of their bearings in relation to Jews in America especially. Many distinguished educators have praised the scope and content of this book but more especially the group studies undertaken at the request of Jewish organizations. The great difficulty of the Jew in America is the problem of strengthening a co-operative attitude with a non-Jewish community without loss of appreciation for Jewish culture and ideals.

Your present reviewer just received a letter from a high school girl in Idaho asking for precisely the information contained in this book, which she wanted for a study of the problem of "How to Live Together." The reply, besides giving some specific information asked for, was a reference to this book. It would be well if some wealthy Jewish philanthropist with a soul above the purely material, even in these days of depression, would send a copy of this book to every University, Teachers College and clergyman in the land. Nevertheless, while we are filled with admiration for the motivation of the book and with many words of praise for its execution it is decidedly not without blemish.

The symposium method is very popular, right now, not alone in this field but in many fields and it has advantages as well as disadvantages. In any symposium there must be a very considerable degree of difference between the contributions. In this book the contributions may be summarized in four categories, poor, medi-

*"Jewish Experiences in America." Published by The Inquiry, New York City, $2.00.

ocre, good and excellent. This is probably true of every symposium, but it is especially true in this case. If I were responsible for a revision of the book I would either print the articles which have been reprinted from magazines in full or I would omit the extracts. It is impossible within space limits to discuss every one of these articles but a good example in the category poor would be that of the contribution of Elma Ehrlich Levinger. Your reviewer read this article originally when it appeared in a magazine and was not very much impressed by its helpfulness. In so far as the Jew is concerned it re-hashes many of the old and worn out platitudes. In so far as the non-Jew is concerned it can not fail to be harmful. Its inclusion in this book in extract form is especially harmful. It is at best popular magazine material and to put it alongside such an article as "Prejudice as a Social Phenomenon" by Julius Drachsler is to link the ridiculous with the sublime. While a great many of the articles are good the outstanding articles are the one mentioned by Professor Drachsler, "Jewish Manners and Manner" by Lewis Browne, "The Conflict of Judaism and Practical Life," by H. A. Wolfson, "Prejudice and Literature" by Abram Simon. The articles by Abram Simon and Prof. Drachsler are of the uttermost importance. Dr. Simon's opening sentence, "Prejudice lives longest in literature" is a challenge in itself. It is certain that Dr. Simon is right when he says that "We shall never be able to measure the ocean of ill will, suspicion and mistrust, for which the Merchant of Venice is directly responsible" to which I would add unless it be the reiterated teaching of the doctrine of the crucifixion in the usual uneducated and unlettered manner. The dissemination of anti-Jewish literature is the most potent source of ill will extant in our modern life.

The book is edited by Bruno Lasker and his own contribution is a study of Jewish handicaps in the employment market. This is a very difficult problem, but I am not sure that anything has been added to our knowledge of the situation nor is any Jew helped particularly by reading what he already knows. On the other hand the clarity in which this situation is outlined by Mr. Lasker should bring illumination to any non-Jew who opens the book, and I am hoping that they will be many. One of the most frequent strictures upon the Jew is his manners, or lack of them. Lewis Browne deals with the problem in an efficient manner in his contribution, although again it is but an extract from a magazine article and should have been printed in full because it is very worth while. With a fuller knowledge of psychology on the part of Jews and non-Jews alike much of this particular criticism of the race, because of the conduct of a minority will eventually disappear. It is a matter of education more than anything else. The article by Prof. Drachsler on "Prejudice as a Social Phenomenon" is outstanding. He accentuates the point that the new psychology demands re-consideration especially of the assumed unalterability of "instruction attitudes." The closing sentence, "Frankly, I think we are in the first stage because we have not begun this specific analysis" admirably sums up the situation. Valuable as the new psychology will be to our children and children's children it seems that it accentuates the difficulties in the immediate present because we have so hazy an idea of what it is all about. This is true not only in relation to this problem but in relation to the use of psychology in our educational institutions and in our daily life. In the questions and answers which follow Prof. Drachsler's paper we have some further clarification. There is a closing sentence there too which is one of the key notes of the situation, i. e. a reference to the lack of human intelligence. This is quite vital to the solution of the problem.

On the whole the writers all seem to pin their hope of a solution upon the fact that with so much Jewish energy released from the large scope, philantrophy, necessitated by immigration until comparatively recent days, there will be a more hopeful era in Jewish life in its relation to non-Jewish life in America. Your reviewer can not share this optimistic viewpoint. In a recent address in New York City a Catholic clergyman made the statement that Protestanism is dead and America well on the way to becoming a Catholic country. With no particular interest in the discussion it seems to me that the gentleman was quite naive. After observing with many others of those who have the right, through experience, to judge our American civilization it seems that while the quarrel between Catholicism and Protestanism goes merrily on the country tends to become "pagan" or hedonistic rather than Catholic or Protestant and the same tendency is overwhelmingly present in the Jewish group. This is especially true in the smaller communities where there are comparatively few Jews and your reviewer writes with an intimate knowledge of both the larger Jewish communities and the small communities in America, extended over a long period of years. To some extent the group loyalty prevails in the larger Jewish populations. There are two reasons for this. Promiscuity on the one hand and pressure from the outside world on the other hand. Both of these factors are absent in a smaller Jewish community and the constantly increasing growth of the pseudo-education of our high schools tends to give a superiority complex to the boy and girl, born of Jewish parents in America and educated in an American high school, from which they never recover and which tends to paganism rather than to any form of Orthodoxy on the one hand or to group loyalty on the other hand. The cessation of immigration will accentuate rather than relieve this situation. The problem lies not so much in a release from philanthropy which would be an unmixed blessing for the Jew and may prove a curse, but rather to the extension of intelligence and a larger viewpoint of education by which boys and girls of every faith in our American schools will divest themselves of religious and racial prejudice and cooperate each with the other in the building of an ethical and spiritual civilization to combat the purely material side of our machine and standardized mode of life in present day America. With such spiritual renaissance there will come inevitably a lessening of racial and religious prejudices. While in many respects imperfect this book is nevertheless of exceeding value and it would be unwise to close a brief review of it without a reference to the reading lists which are of the uttermost importance. It would be well if every Jewish high school boy and girl as well as every non-Jewish high school boy and girl would read at least, a quota of the books and pamphlets and articles referred to in these reading lists. This would be an intelligible part of the educational process heretofore referred to. The Jew in America is obligated to those responsible for "Inquiry" and for this book. One may hope that a revised edition may come to us later with some of the poorer matter eliminated and some further articles of the Drachsler standard incorporated.

EMANUEL STERNHEIM.

(*Continued from Page* 338)

behoof of my countrymen, such testimony to the gigantic changes in this country as I have hinted at tonight. Also, to record that wherever I have been, in the smallest places equally with the largest, I have been received with unsurpassable politeness, delicacy, sweet temper, hospitality, consideration, and with unsurpassable respect for the privacy daily enforced upon me by the nature of my avocation here, and the state of my health.

"This testimony, so long as I live and so long as my descendants have any legal right in my books, I shall cause to be republished, as an appendix to every copy of those two books of mine in which I have referred to America. And this I will do and cause to be done, not in mere love and thankfulness, but because I regard it as an act of plain justice and honor."

Charles Dickens is unquestionably revered in this country. No better evidence of this fact could be adduced than to give a list of the cities and towns within our borders in which branches of the world-wide Dickens Fellowship are in active operation, every winter, to the benefit and the delight of thousands of members: Bethlehem, Pa.; Boston, Mass.; Chester, Pa.; Chicago, Ill.; East Bay, Calif.; Everett, Wash.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Madison, Wis.; Marinette, Wis.; Nazareth, Pa.; New York City; Old Town-Orono, Me.; Pasadena, Calif.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Racine, Wis.; Seattle, Wash.; Sierra Madre, Calif.; and in addition, there are similar Fellowship branches throughout Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Africa, Canada, Argentina and Denmark.

The men and women who retain their membership in this great international body year after year, assuredly were not "won" to Charles Dickens because he had characterized them—to quote Mr. Shaw's words—"as windbags, swindlers and assassins." Far from it! They give him their deepest respect as a great social reformer, a profound philosopher, an enticing and clean-minded humorist and a surpassingly excellent story-teller; and they heartily recognize in him the depth of a friendship that, in the moment of his realization of an error, had the outspoken manliness to record it imperishably "as an act of plain justice and honor."

Such is Charles Dickens. Such is America. Such is Mr. Shaw.

—*Arthur Elliot Sproul*

Boston *Transcript*

Some Conclusions of a Recent Seminar

There are two tasks before the Christian churches of America in relation to the Negro: First, the provision of educational opportunity for the Negro; second, the education of white America to the end that the new Negro—the product of such education—shall have a chance to live under conditions of self-respect, and to work under conditions of just recognition. The first of these obligations has been recognized, and much has been done to meet it. The second has been given scant recognition, and almost nothing has been done to realize it.

The churches of America can, if they will, set out upon a new crusade. It will not be enough that they should do good to the Negro by giving him opportunity for schooling and by finding him jobs in factories and offices. The churches must do good to themselves by breaking away from the master-and-slave complex which still rules the thinking of both north and south.

The churches will be in a position to go ahead upon this new crusade when they discover that a decent set of attitudes in the nation will bring positive gifts to the national life, an enrichment of our culture, and new wealth of personal resource.
wealth of personal resource.
lesson from the appeal of missionary schools. There are exceptions. An unusually fine group of men and women are coming to the front in the church programs for Negro education. By and large, the appeal is still a sort of glorified "Be-kind-to-the-Negro" thing which is not edifying. No one enjoys it, except perhaps the white saints in New England and such places.

It is high time that the churches hear less from promotional secretaries and college presidents about the Negro, and more from the Negro himself. They should know more about the part which the Negro is taking in the arts. They should visit Fisk and marvel at the most significant feature on the campus—the murals in the Fisk library by Aaron Douglas. Church councils and conventions should have a new type of speaker. They should hear E. Franklin Frazier of the Social Science Research council and of Fisk university. They should hear Abram Harris of Howard; Sue Bailey of the National Y. W. C. A.; Forrester B. Washington of the Atlanta school of social work; H. Council Trenholm of the Montgomery State Teachers college.

I would not seem unappreciative of the work of the colleges which northern benevolence has made possible. They offer their own exhibit of work well done. But northern Christianity is bankrupt if it rests content with good work well done. It should now invite the keenest and the most critical of the products of these institutions to serve in a reciprocal educational venture—the education of the white north, the benevolent north, which is often content to do good, oblivious of the more pressing obligation to gain good.

—*Herbert C. Herring*

From *The Christian Century*

Chateau de Bures
par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise
17 Miles from Paris, France
Country Boarding School
To Prepare Boys for American Colleges
30 Acres Own Farm
New Dormitories With Outdoor Sleeping Porches
Gymnasium. Athletic Fields
Modern, Progressive Methods
Music, Art, Sciences
English, French, and American Masters
For information address
EDWIN CORNELL ZAVITZ, Headmaster
Chateau de Bures, par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise, France

HERESY: Bishop Brown's Quarterly Lectures for 1930, now complete. Subjects: I The American Race Problem; II The Pope's Crusade Against the Soviet Union; III The Science of Moscow and the Superstition of Rome; IV The Godly Bishops and the Godless Bolsheviks. 10 cents per copy and 25 cents for a full set. Free to radical organizations for sale at meetings and to unemployed workers.
THE BRADFORD-BROWN EDUCATIONAL CO.
GALION, OHIO

Be Yourself
A Periodical for Precarious Times
The Glass Hive—An American Group Book
(*ten times the year $2 c20 ea 4th yr*)
Edited by Will Levington Comfort, Box 33 So. Pasadena, California

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876